



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/003,315

12/06/2001

Shang-Che Cheng

MR2857-5

4842

22907

7590

06/01/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF

1001 G STREET N W

SUITE 1100

WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

NEURAUTER, GEORGE C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/003,315		CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	George C. Neurauter, Jr.		2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 are currently presented and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Lakritz fails to teach or suggest a provider, a subscriber, a site-to-site relationship manager for identifying the provider and subscriber relationships, or transferring data to an interrelated data source identified as a subscriber site.

The specification discloses:

"A system for managing the resources of multiple interrelated web sites is provided to provide automatic detection of resource updates at particular web sites, identified as resource providers, transferring the updates to other sites, identified as subscribers, wherein the transferred resource may be translated and/or localized, as required."
(paragraph 0025)

Lakritz discloses:

"A preferred embodiment of the invention automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor and directs the Web server to deliver the appropriate localized

Art Unit: 2143

content contained in one or more country/language databases to the visitor's browser..." (column 2, lines 28-32)

"A system according to the invention provides an intuitive user interface for facilitating the localization of documents, data streams, and non-text files for multilingual Internet Web sites, enabling the Web site manager to incrementally update the language content of a Web site or document." (column 3, lines 27-31)

"Regions are mapped and organized according to the Web site's needs. For example, a mutli-user (sp) server can have a separate region definition for each user's site. The regions file organizes the regions, countries, and languages that the user is concerned with and is configured by the user. The user sets up a mapping, for example, one user can have information specific to Italy and another user can have information that is just concerned with the European region and is not concerned with Italy. This approach allows a hierarchical region-based lookup scheme. Content is hierarchically stored as country and language independent elements such that a one-to-many and many-to-one mapping exists between country and language. The advantage to this approach is that there is no content duplication; the user has only as many files in the system as he has unique content." (column 6, lines 35-49)

Art Unit: 2143

"Referring to FIG. 7, the Manager's Console detects when a document in the master language has been updated 705. It then notifies the Web site manager which corresponding documents in the other languages require translation 706. The Manager's Console provides "one-touch" translation, whereby at the click of a button, documents from any source requiring translation are converted to the internal format 703, staged down the Workflow Pipeline 704 then dynamically routed and sequenced to the individual Translation Resources where the actual translation is performed." (column 9, lines 44-53)

"Parsers are also invoked whenever a document is extracted from the Translation queues and sent down the Pipeline. The Parser converts the document into the internal format. Generators are, in a similar manner, invoked whenever a translated document is posted back onto the Translation queues after completion of translation. The Generator converts the internal format document back to the document's original format (e.g., HTML). The document is then sent to the final destination." (column 11, lines 52-60)

In view of the disclosures of the specification, the Examiner is not persuaded by these arguments. The claims only nominally recite identifying a provider and subscriber

Art Unit: 2143

relationship and therefore do not specifically recite any sort of specific relationship between a provider and a subscriber.

In view of the disclosures of Lakritz, a web site is partitioned by language features and localization features such as a particular country in separate databases. Each partition is unique with respect to these features and have corresponding documents that require translation into the particular language and/or localization feature. Therefore, a "provider" as claimed and as defined in the specification is a partition, which is interpreted to a separate and distinct web site since Latritz discloses that the invention "automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor and directs the Web server to deliver the appropriate localized content contained in one or more country/language databases to the visitor's browser" (see column 2, lines 28-32), that provides a document that a "subscriber" requires for translation. The Examiner emphasizes that a nominal recitation of identification of "relationships" between two entities may be interpreted in accordance with the broadest reasonable interpretation as required by MPEP 2111 as identifying any sort of relationship between these two entities since the claims do not specifically define and/or exclude any sort of relationship. As shown above and as shown previously by the Examiner in the previous Office Action, column 9, lines 44-

Art Unit: 2143

53 of Lakritz discloses that a relationship based on the requirement that a document is to be translated and is transferred from one partition to another is identified.

Therefore, the Examiner submits that Lakritz does disclose the invention as currently claimed and the claims are not in condition for allowance.

The Applicant's submission under 37 CFR 1.105 has been considered by the Examiner and is deemed to be a complete reply to the Examiner's requirements.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6 623 529 to Lakritz.

Regarding claim 1, Lakritz discloses a globalization management system for managing resources of multiple

Art Unit: 2143

interrelated data sources corresponding to a plurality of sites accessed through a communications network ("country/language database and file systems"), comprising:

a plurality of target application interfaces ("adaptors"), each of said target application interfaces being respectively coupled to at least one of the interrelated data sources through the communications network (column 10, lines 40-42), each of said target application interfaces including means for converting a protocol of the respective data source ("original format") to a predetermined protocol ("internal format") and said predetermined protocol to said protocol of the respective data source (column 9, lines 4-9; column 10, lines 40-42; column 11, lines 36-60); and

a global management engine ("Workflow Manager") coupled to said plurality of target application interfaces, said global management engine communicating with each of said target application interfaces with said predetermined protocol (column 11, lines 28-60; column 9, line 64-column 10, line 4), said global management engine including (a) a site-to-site relationship manager for identifying provider ("master site") and subscriber ("site" that has "documents that require translation") relationships, language translation, and localization requirements between the plurality of sites,

Art Unit: 2143

(column 9, lines 44-47; column 9, line 64-column 10, line 4) (b) means for reading data representing current content from the interrelated data sources identified as provider sites by said site-to-site relationship manager, (c) means for comparing said data representing current content with data representing prior content to identify content changes at a respective provider site (column 9, lines 44-47), and (d) a project manager for transferring said data identified as a content change by said comparing means to at least one of said interrelated data sources identified as a subscriber site by said site-to-site relationship manager (column 11, lines 17-60).

Regarding claim 2, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said project manager includes means for transferring said data identified as a content change by said comparing means to a language translation site ("translation resources") through the communications network responsive to said site-to-site relationship manager identifying said content change data as requiring language translation, said project manager including means for receiving data from said language translation site and transferring said received data to at least one of said interrelated data sources identified as subscriber site. (column 9, lines 44-47; column 11, lines 17-60)

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 3, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said project manager includes means for localizing said data identified as a content change by said comparing means responsive to said site-to-site relationship manager identifying said content change data as requiring localization. (column 12, lines 20-61)

Regarding claim 4, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said global management engine is implemented on a server coupled to the communications network. (column 14, lines 38-48)

Regarding claim 5, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said current content from the interrelated data sources is stored in a repository selected from the group consisting of a database system, a file system, a content management system and a combination thereof. ("country/language database and file systems") (see also column 10, lines 27-30 and 40-42)

Claims 6-14 are also rejected since these claims recite a method that contain substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2143

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

Art Unit: 2143

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz.

Regarding claim 15, Lakritz discloses the method as recited in claim 1 where said step of identifying includes the step of identifying site content requiring copying of said content for a predetermined site content subscriber as shown above regarding claim 14.

Lakritz does not expressly disclose wherein the identification step associates a HIDE flag with the site content requiring copying, however, Lakritz does disclose that the site content requiring copying is noted by the globalization management system. (column 9, lines 44-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lakritz since the reference suggests that the site content requiring copying is noted by the globalization management system and that this notation is used to determine which site content requires content (column 9, lines 44-57). In view of these suggestions and teachings shown above, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to modify the reference so

Art Unit: 2143

that any sort of notation associated with the site content including the use of a flag in order for the site content to be designated to be copied.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9AM to 5:30PM Eastern.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

gcn


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100